

and to participate in the notion of economic development that the richness of our cultural diversity and our heritage languages becomes a priority item, at least for this Government.

I heard people on the other side complaining about the Government taking so long to come forward with a number of initiatives, including the naming of a Minister. One of the first initiatives of the Government was to set up consultation processes. Whether we were talking about the changes in tax policy or the multicultural policy, the Government said, in the interests of national unity and in the interests of getting the legislation correct and making sure that it would function, it must set in place processes that provide better consultation.

It is a pipe dream for anyone to think that the moment they are elected to this Chamber somehow or another the necessary expertise to deal with all the subjects that affect Canadians falls out of the sky. Hopefully, the electorate of this country choose men and women to come to this Chamber who have some broad base of experience, a lot of common sense, and a capacity to ask good questions and listen to the answers. In the final analysis it is our job to referee disputes and produce legislation that will help us as a nation to progress. At the heart of our capacity to produce good legislation lies the notion of our capacity to consult. Consultation takes time. If one is sincere in an attempt to consult, then one has to acknowledge that there must be the passage of time spent to listen, time spent to dialogue, and time spent to reach conclusions. All of that has to be done in the context of priorities.

When this Government came into office in 1984, the nation was looking bankruptcy in the eye. We had runaway borrowing. The Government of Canada was borrowing an amount that was equivalent to more than 90 per cent of the savings of Canadians. There was no money left for Canadians to borrow to buy a car, a home, or other things without going to the international market, reducing the value of our dollar, and increasing interest rates. Our standard of living was falling like a rocket. The Government came into office with many commitments. However, the priority was to straighten out the economic situation in order that there would be jobs for Canadians to enable them to participate fully in society.

I stand here four years later with certain knowledge that there are approximately 1,300,000 more Canadians with jobs today than there were in September, 1984. It is a record of achievement. It had to be dealt with first. We could not have a Canadian heritage language institute, or the budget money for that very important initiative, or the Bill before us today, if we continued on the path that the previous Government had taken us on.

Bankruptcy produces a situation where none of the good or positive things can be done. Bankruptcy would have eroded our health care system and our unemployment insurance system. Bankruptcy would have eroded our colleges, universities, and all our social programs. We make no apology for commencing our four year term of office with those initiatives required to restore the country to economic health, to provide jobs for

Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act

Canadians and ultimately taxes for the public purse, to reduce the deficit, and put us on a path that would lead to the health that we are enjoying today.

I wish to deal with the amendments for one moment and urge my colleagues to defeat the amendments. Motion No. 5 seeks to take a four-year period and reduce it to three for the Minister to comment on the success of an institute. I believe that four years might even be a little short. Certainly, to make public evaluation comments after three years in the life span of a new institute with a mandate of this type is simply too soon.

Motion No. 6 has some detail on where the reports of the institute should be referred. The Standing Orders take care of that situation. Therefore, Motion No. 6 is not necessary, and probably it is not a good idea.

I urge my colleagues in the Chamber to approve the Bill, but to reject the two proposed amendments before us at this time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The first question is on Motion No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The recorded division will be deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 6 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.